

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al
Serial No.: 10/748,178
Filed: December 31, 2003
Office Action Mailing Date: November 1, 2010

Examiner: GYORFI Thomas A.
Group Art Unit: 2435
Attorney Docket: **27153**
Confirmation No.: 5563

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1- 61, 63-80, 107–130, and 147 - 149 are in this Application. Claims 62, 81-106 and 131-146 have previously been cancelled. Claims 36, 37, 64 and 67 are cancelled in the present response.

Claims 1-61, 63 - 80, 107–130, and 147 - 149 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1, 38, 63, 73, 107, 110, 130 and 149 have been amended herewith.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-61, 63-80, 109–130, and 147 - 149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ginter et al. (US Patent No. 5,892,900), hereinafter "Ginter", in view of Gilmour (US Patent No. 6,205,472) hereinafter "Gilmour" or Ginter in view of Venners.

Claims 107-109 are rejected as being obvious in light of "Java Security: How to Install the Security Manager and Customize Your Security Policy" (hereinafter "Venners") in view of Gilmour.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. However to expedite prosecution of the case, amendments were made to the independent claims to introduce the features of original claims 36, 37, 64 and 67, which are now cancelled without prejudice.

Specifically, the claims now recite the added feature that:

"said information protection comprises protecting information held within a software data processing application able to process said information, wherein said software data processing application authenticates itself to a server before at least some of the sessions wherein said authentication depends on a classification level assigned to said protected information, wherein connection to at least two

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al
Serial No.: 10/748,178
Filed: December 31, 2003
Office Action Mailing Date: November 1, 2010

Examiner: GYORFI Thomas A.
Group Art Unit: 2435
Attorney Docket: **27153**
Confirmation No.: 5563

servers are required in order to determine said policy and wherein said software data processing application is entangled with said server's software, such that a functioning stand-alone copy of said software data processing application does not exist".

The Examiner, in rejecting claim 36, cites Ginter col. 36 lines 10 – 45 and col. 168 lines 45 – 67. Ginter column 36 mentions a client administrator but says nothing about authentication. Column 168 teaches that a *user* appliance may authenticate itself to a clearinghouse. Presumably the clearinghouse is a server but there is a difference between authentication of a client – meaning a *software* application running *on* a terminal, and authentication of an appliance – meaning the user station or terminal, and Ginter says nothing about authentication of the *client*.

The Examiner, in rejecting claim 37, refers to Ginter column 302 lines 50 – 55. This passage teaches different classification levels. However it fails to teach that *the level of authentication* between the server and client should *depend* on this classification level. There is nothing in Ginter to tie authorization levels to the different classification levels.

Claim 64 is rejected by the Examiner on the basis of Ginter column 307 lines 25 – 55. However Column 307 does not discuss policies or requiring two servers to allow determination of policies. It merely teaches about VDE participants obtaining data from repositories. The participants may make use of a network to gain access to a server system, and then they can obtain access to the content containers. There is nothing about policies, certainly not about *determining* policies.

Claim 67 is rejected by the Examiner on the basis that Ginter column 103 lines 45 - 67 teaches entanglement of client software. Presumably the Examiner is referring to lines 58 to 62 which refer to an authentication manager, secure database manager and secure communications manager, and where it is taught that only a subset of functions and information are provided.

Claim 67 is however distinguished from a system which withholds some of the functions and some of the information. Claim 67 provides that "a functioning stand

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al
 Serial No.: 10/748,178
 Filed: December 31, 2003
 Office Action Mailing Date: November 1, 2010

Examiner: GYORFI Thomas A.
 Group Art Unit: 2435
 Attorney Docket: **27153**
 Confirmation No.: 5563

alone copy...*does not exist*". In other words, Ginter teaches something which functions but not with all its functions and not with all its information. The claimed feature is however for something that does not work at all unless the client and server are cooperating.

In view of the above points, it is respectfully submitted that Gimour combined with Ginter fails to teach or suggest the combination wherein:

"said information protection comprises protecting information held within a software data processing application able to process said information, wherein said software data processing application authenticates itself to a server before at least some of the sessions wherein said authentication depends on a classification level assigned to said protected information, wherein connection to at least two servers are required in order to determine said policy and wherein said software data processing application is entangled with said server's software, such that a functioning stand-alone copy of said software data processing application does not exist".

Thus claim 1 is believed to be novel and inventive in light of the cited prior art.

The same amendment has been made to each of the other independent claims, which are believed to be novel and inventive for the same reasons.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-80, 107-130 and 147 - 149 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
 Registration No. 56,437
 Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: March 7, 2011

Enclosures:

- Petition for Extension (Two Months)
- Request for Continued Examination (RCE)